AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 1 and 2. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 1 and 2, replace the original sheets including Figures 1 and 2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-3 are currently amended. Claims 6-9 are added as new. No new matter has been added, as the amendments are supported by the specification, claims, and drawings as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

Applicant has attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets", Applicant has amended the term "exchange" to "switch" to accurately define the subject-matter to which the protection scope is sought and to correspond with the amended specification. No new matter has been added to the drawings.

SPECIFICATION

Applicant has amended the term "exchange" to "switch" to clarify the subject-matter to which the protection scope is sought. A person with ordinary skill will recognize in the art that "exchange" refers to a telephone exchange, and that a "switch" is utilized in a data communication field, which could require variable bandwidth. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Calvignac et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,763,321). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Calvignac appears to relate to a method for dynamically allocating circuit slots in frames. The frames are delimited by flags and divided into bit slots which may be used for synchronous circuit flow or asynchronous packet flow. It should be noted that the meaning of the term "slot" in Calvignac appears to be an assigned place in a sequence or schedule. It thus appears to refer to a time slot in a sub-frame used for transmitting the circuit flow or the packet flow (Calvignac, FIG. 2A). The term "slot" in claim 1 refers to a socket in a microcomputer that will accept a plug-in circuit board. Specifically, it refers to a hardware plugged in a service processing board (page 1, paragraph [0004] in the specification originally filed).

Regarding the difference between the term "slot" in claim 1 and Calvignac, although Calvignac appears to address dynamic allocation of bandwidth, Calvignac relates to allocation of time slots in a sub-frame for circuit flow and packet flow. Claim 1 provides for dynamic allocation of bandwidth for a plurality of hardware slots plugged in a service processing board of a switch to support multiple lower flow service processing boards to avoid bandwidth waste (page 1, paragraph [0006] in the specification originally filed). It can be seen from the discussion that Calvignac and claim 1 are in totally different technical areas.

As stated above, claim 1 is directed to dynamic allocation of slot bandwidth on a switch. Claim 1 is further directed to dynamic allocation of bandwidth through N-

selected-one devices, and each slot is connected with the N-selected-one service. The output of each N-selected-one device is connected with the main switch module. Thus, through controlling the N-selected-one devices being gated, the bandwidth allocated to each of the N slots can be dynamically changed. However, Calvignac does not anticipate, teach, or suggest the N-selected-one devices and the dynamic bandwidth allocation to the slots, and controlling the N-selected-one devices being gated to allocate the bandwidth to gated slots.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 defines over the art cited by the Examiner. Likewise, claim 4 which depends from claim 1, also defines over the art cited by the Examiner.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calvignac et al. as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Barr ("How Programmable Logic Works", by Michael Barr, 1999, by Miller Freeman, Inc.). Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calvignac et al. as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Altera's data sheet. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calvignac et al. as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Vitesse's data sheet. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The arguments made above with respect to Calvignac apply equally hereto. Further, Calvignac, individually or in combination with the additional cited art, fails to

teach or suggest the rejected claims. This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that either of Barr, Altera's data sheet, or Vitesse's data sheet, like Calvignac, does not teach or suggest the above-discussed technical features. Instead, as admitted by the Examiner, Barr merely mentions a programmable logic chip, Altera's data sheet at best only discloses an EPLD with type EPM7256AEQC208-10, and Vitesse's data sheet at best only mentions the 1.25 GHz Ethernet signal driver with type VSC7132YB. None of the cited references disclose or suggest the N-selected-one devices and the dynamic bandwidth allocation to the slots, and controlling the N-selected-one devices being gated to allocate the bandwidth to gated slots.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 3 and 5 define over the art cited by the Examiner. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C §103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 08-0750, under Order No. 9896-000003/US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: July 13, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata
Registration No.: 37,166
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1223
Attorney for Applicant

Attachments